

**STAIL PEMBELAJARAN PELAJAR TERHADAP
PRESTASI AKADEMIK DI UiTM KAMPUS ARAU**

HAMIDAH BT JAAFAR SIDEK

**UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA
2002**

STAIL PEMBELAJARAN PELAJAR TERHADAP PRESTASI
AKADEMIK DI UiTM KAMPUS ARAU

Tesis ini diserahkan kepada Sekolah Siswazah
sebagai memenuhi sebahagian daripada keperluan
Ijazah Sarjana Sains (Pengurusan Pendidikan)
Universiti Utara Malaysia

Oleh
Hamidah bt Jaafar Sidek

KEBENARAN MENGGUNAKAN TESIS

Tesis ini dikemukakan sebagai memenuhi sebahagian daripada keperluan pengijazahan program Sarjana Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM). Saya bersetuju membenarkan pihak perpustakaan UUM mempamerkannya sebagai bahan rujukan. Saya juga bersetuju bahawa sebarang bentuk salinan sama ada secara keseluruhan atau sebahagian daripada tesis ini untuk tujuan akademik adalah dibolehkan dengan kebenaran penyelia tesis atau Dekan Sekolah Siswazah. Sebarang bentuk salinan atau cetakan bagi tujuan komersial dan membuat keuntungan adalah dilarang sama sekali tanpa kebenaran bertulis daripada penyelidik. Pernyataan rujukan kepada penulis dan UUM perlulah dinyatakan jika sebarang bentuk rujukan dibuat ke atas tesis ini.

Kebenaran untuk menyalin atau menggunakan tesis ini sama ada keseluruhan atau sebahagian daripadanya hendaklah dipohon melalui :

Dekan Sekolah Siswazah

Universiti Utara Malaysia

06010 UUM Sintok

Kedah Darul Aman

Abstrak

Kajian ini bertujuan untuk mengenal pasti kesan faktor-faktor demografik, rangsangan dan stail pembelajaran pelajar dan hubungannya dengan prestasi akademik mereka. Dua instrumen, Inventori Stail Pembelajaran (Dunn, Dunn dan Price, 1978) yang telah diubahsuai dan Soal Selidik Persepsi Pemilihan Stail Pembelajaran (Reid, 1984) telah diberikan kepada satu sampel rawak berstrata seramai 339 pelajar diploma daripada pelbagai program di UiTM Kampus Arau. Kesan latar belakang pelajar (jumlah pendapatan ibu bapa dan tahap pendidikan ibu) terhadap prestasi akademik pelajar didapati signifikan. Dapatan kajian juga menunjukkan terdapat perbezaan yang signifikan di antara pelajar lelaki dan perempuan di dalam rangsangan persekitaran dan fizikal, di mana pelajar lelaki adalah kurang dipengaruhi oleh rangsangan tersebut berbanding dengan pelajar perempuan. Kedua-dua pelajar lelaki dan perempuan dalam semua program memilih untuk belajar pada waktu awal pagi dan malam dan juga memilih untuk belajar di persekitaran yang sunyi dan mempunyai cahaya yang terang dengan tempat belajar yang formal. Di antara enam jenis stail pembelajaran, didapati stail auditori dan kinestetik merupakan stail pembelajaran yang paling digemari oleh pelajar manakala stail pembelajaran individu adalah stail yang paling tidak digemari. Data juga menunjukkan bahawa terdapat perbezaan yang signifikan di antara pelajar lelaki dan perempuan dalam stail pembelajaran kinestetik, taktil dan individu, di mana pelajar lelaki adalah lebih individu tetapi kurang kinestetik dan taktil berbanding dengan pelajar perempuan di dalam stail pembelajaran mereka. Dari segi program, keputusan keseluruhan menunjukkan stail pembelajaran yang paling digemari pelajar ialah auditori dan kinestetik dan stail paling tidak digemari ialah individu dan visual. Dapatan kajian juga menunjukkan bahawa pelajar sains mempunyai skor min pemilihan yang lebih tinggi untuk stail kinestetik, auditori dan kumpulan, pelajar perniagaan memilih stail auditori dan kinestetik, manakala pelajar kejuruteraan memilih stail auditori dan taktil. Didapati juga perbezaan yang signifikan di dalam stail pembelajaran pelajar di antara program, di mana pelajar kejuruteraan adalah kurang visual daripada pelajar sains dan perniagaan. Dapatan kajian juga menunjukkan bahawa terdapat korelasi yang lemah di antara rangsangan emosi dan stail pembelajaran berkumpulan dengan pencapaian akademik pelajar. Berdasarkan kepada dapatan kajian, beberapa cadangan dibuat untuk membantu pensyarah dalam pengajaran dengan menyesuaikan pemilihan rangsangan dan stail pembelajaran pelajar dengan pendekatan pengajaran mereka.

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to identify the effects of students' demographic factors and their preferred learning stimuli and learning styles with relation to their academic achievement. Two instruments, the adapted Learning Style Inventory (Dunn, Dunn and Price, 1978) and Perceptual Learning Style Preference Survey (Reid, 1984), were administered to a stratified random sample of 339 diploma students from various programs in UiTM Arau Campus. The effect of students' backgrounds (parents' income and mothers' education level) are found to be significant. Results also indicated that male and female students are found to differ significantly in the environmental and physical stimuli, where the male students are less affected by the stimuli compared to the female students. Both male and female students in all the programs prefer to study in the early morning and at night and also prefer to study in a quiet environment with bright lighting in a formal setting. Among the six types of learning styles, auditory and kinesthetic are the most popular among the students, while individual learning style is the least preferred. The data also showed that male and female students are found to differ significantly in the kinesthetic, tactile and individual style, where the male students are more individual but less kinesthetic and tactile compared to female students in their learning style. In terms of programs, the overall result indicated that the major learning styles preferred by the students are auditory and kinesthetic and the least preferred styles are individual and visual. The results also showed that science students have a higher mean score preference for kinesthetic, auditory and group styles, business students prefer auditory and kinesthetic styles while engineering students prefer auditory and tactile styles. It was also found that there is a significant difference in their learning styles between programs, where the engineering students are less visual than science and business students. Results also indicated that there is a weak correlation between emotional stimulus and group learning style with students' academic performance. Based on the results, a number of recommendations are made to help the lecturers in their teaching by accommodating the students' preferred learning stimuli and learning styles to their teaching approaches.

Penghargaan

Syukur ke hadrat Allah s.w.t. di atas limpah taufik dan hidayahnya sehingga membolehkan tesis ini diselesaikan seperti yang dirancang.

Kesempatan ini digunakan untuk mengucapkan terma kasih dan setinggi-setinggi penghargaan kepada Profesor Madya Dr. Nurahimah Mohd. Yusoff selaku penyelia di atas bimbingan dan nasihat yang amat berharga di sepanjang tempoh menyiapkan tesis ini.

Ucapan terima kasih juga ditujukan kepada pensyarah kanan Fakulti Perakaunan UiTM Kampus Arau, Profesor Madya Encik Lee Chew San kerana membantu dalam menganalisis data serta Koordinator Pusat Bahasa UiTM Kampus Arau, Profesor Madya Hajah Zakiah Azmi kerana telah menterjemahkan soal selidik asal ke Bahasa Malaysia.

Penghargaan ini juga ditujukan kepada Timbalan Pengarah Akademik UiTM Kampus Arau, Profesor Madya Dr. Haji Khudzir Haji Ismail yang memberi kerjasama dan kebenaran untuk melaksanakan penyelidikan di kampus ini serta para pelajar yang menjadi responden terhadap kajian ini.

Seterusnya penghargaan dirakamkan juga kepada rakan-rakan pensyarah di UiTM Kampus Arau dan rakan-rakan seperjuangan, khususnya Kohort 3, yang banyak membantu dalam proses pengumpulan data serta meleraikan segala kebuntuan.

Akhir kata, tidak lupa juga rasa setinggi-tinggi penghargaan kepada suami, Abd. Karim Sharif dan anak-anak yang memberi dorongan dan sokongan moral dalam usaha menyempurnakan tesis ini.

KANDUNGAN

Muka surat

Kebenaran Menggunakan Tesis.....	i
Abstrak.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Penghargaan.....	iv
Kandungan.....	v
Senarai Jadual	ix
Senarai Rajah	xii

BAB 1 : PENGENALAN

Pengenalan	1
Latar Belakang Kajian	2
Pernyataan Masalah	5
Soalan Kajian	7
Tujuan Kajian	8
Objektif Kajian	8
Hipotesis	9

Kepentingan Kajian	10
Skop dan Batas Kajian	11
Andaian Kajian	12
Definisi Istilah	12
Rumusan	16

BAB II : TINJAUAN LITERATUR

Pengenalan	17
Model dan Teori Stail Pembelajaran	20
Instrumen Stail Pembelajaran	24
Stail Pembelajaran dan Pencapaian Akademik	27
Faktor Demografik dan Pencapaian Akademik	30
Rangsangan Pembelajaran dan Pencapaian Akademik	34
Rumusan	35

BAB III : METODOLOGI KAJIAN

Pengenalan	37
Reka Bentuk Kajian	38
Kerangka Konseptual	39
Kaedah Kajian	40
Instrumen	41
Tempat Kajian	46
Persampelan	47
Pengumpulan Data	49

Analisis Data	49
Rumusan	51

BAB IV : DAPATAN KAJIAN

Pengenalan	52
Dapatan Kajian	53
Latar Belakang Responden	53
Rangsangan Pembelajaran	65
Stail Pembelajaran	76
Ujian Hipotesis	88
Perbezaan Di Antara Jantina dan Rangsangan Pembelajaran	88
Perbezaan Di Antara Jantina dan Stail Pembelajaran	89
Perbezaan Di Antara Rangsangan Pembelajaran Dengan Pelbagai Program.....	90
Perbezaan Di Antara Stail Pembelajaran Pelajar Dengan Pelbagai Program.....	91
Perbezaan Di Antara Jumlah Pendapatan dan Tahap Pendidikan Ibu Bapa Dengan Pencapaian Akademik Pelajar	94
Perbezaan Di Antara Jumlah Pendapatan Ibu Bapa Dengan Pencapaian Akademik Pelajar	94
Perbezaan Di Antara Tahap Pendidikan Bapa Dengan Pencapaian Akademik Pelajar	97
Perbezaan Di Antara Tahap Pendidikan Ibu Dengan Pencapaian Akademik Pelajar	98
Perhubungan Di Antara Jumlah Jam Belajar Seminggu Dengan Pencapaian Akademik Pelajar	100

Perhubungan Di Antara Rangsangan Pembelajaran Dengan Pencapaian Akademik Pelajar	101
Perhubungan Di Antara Stail Pembelajaran Dengan Pencapaian Akademik Pelajar	102
Rumusan	104

BAB V : PERBINCANGAN, RUMUSAN DAN CADANGAN

Pengenalan	106
Latar Belakang Responden	107
Rangsangan Pembelajaran	109
Stail Pembelajaran	109
Rumusan	113
Implikasi dan Cadangan	115
Cadangan Kajian Lanjutan	119

BIBLIOGRAFI	120
--------------------------	-----

LAMPIRAN

Lampiran : Soal selidik	130
-------------------------------	-----

SENARAI JADUAL

Muka surat

Jadual 2.1 : Dikotomi Stail Pembelajaran	19
Jadual 3.1 : Skala Likert	42
Jadual 3.2 : Jadual Spesifikasi Soal Selidik	45
Jadual 3.3 : Bilangan Responden Dalam Pelbagai Program	48
Jadual 4.1 : Umur Responden	54
Jadual 4.2 : Jantina	55
Jadual 4.3 : Pengkhususan Program	56
Jadual 4.4 : Bahagian Program	57
Jadual 4.5 : Kedudukan Sekolah	58
Jadual 4.6 : Jenis Sekolah	58
Jadual 4.7 : Jumlah Pendapatan Ibu Bapa	59
Jadual 4.8 : Tahap Pendidikan Bapa	60
Jadual 4.9 : Tahap Pendidikan Ibu	61
Jadual 4.10 : Pekerjaan Bapa	62
Jadual 4.11 : Pekerjaan Ibu	63
Jadual 4.12 : Skor Min Jumlah Jam Belajar Seminggu	64
Jadual 4.13 : Skor Min Pencapaian Akademik Pelajar (GPA)	64
Jadual 4.14 : Skor Min Rangsangan Pembelajaran Dengan Jantina	65
Jadual 4.15 : Skor Min Persekitaran Pembelajaran Dengan Jantina	66

Jadual 4.16 : Skor Min Persekitaran Pembelajaran Dengan Pelbagai Program	67
Jadual 4.17 : Skor Min Pemilihan Masa Belajar Dengan Jantina	68
Jadual 4.18 : Skor Min Pemilihan Masa Belajar Dengan Pelbagai Program	69
Jadual 4.19 : Respon Pelajar Terhadap Rangsangan Persekitaran	71
Jadual 4.20 : Respon Pelajar Terhadap Rangsangan Fizikal	72
Jadual 4.21 : Respon Pelajar Terhadap Rangsangan Emosi	73
Jadual 4.22 : Respon Pelajar Terhadap Rangsangan Psikologi	75
Jadual 4.23 : Skor Min Stail Pembelajaran Dengan Jantina	77
Jadual 4.24 : Skor Min Stail Pembelajaran Dengan Pelbagai Program	80
Jadual 4.25 : Respon Pelajar Terhadap Stail Pembelajaran Auditori	82
Jadual 4.26 : Respon Pelajar Terhadap Stail Pembelajaran Visual	83
Jadual 4.27 : Respon Pelajar Terhadap Stail Pembelajaran Kinestetik	84
Jadual 4.28 : Respon Pelajar Terhadap Stail Pembelajaran Taktil	85
Jadual 4.29 : Respon Pelajar Terhadap Stail Pembelajaran Kumpulan	86
Jadual 4.30 : Respon Pelajar Terhadap Stail Pembelajaran Individu	87
Jadual 4.31 : Jadual Ujian-t Jantina Dan Rangsangan Pembelajaran	88
Jadual 4.32 : Jadual Ujian-t Jantina Dan Stail Pembelajaran	89
Jadual 4.33 : Jadual ANOVA Rangsangan Pembelajaran Dengan Pelbagai Program	90
Jadual 4.34a : Jadual Ujian Homogeneiti Varian	91
Jadual 4.34b : Jadual ANOVA Stail Pembelajaran Dengan Pelbagai Program	92
Jadual 4.34c : Jadual Ujian Scheffe Stail Visual Dengan Program	93
Jadual 4.35a : Jadual ANOVA Jumlah Pendapatan Ibu Bapa Dengan GPA	95
Jadual 4.35b : Jadual Ujian Scheffe Jumlah Pendapatan Ibu Bapa Dengan GPA	96

Jadual 4.36 : Jadual ANOVA Tahap Pendidikan Bapa Dengan GPA	97
Jadual 4.37a : Jadual ANOVA Tahap Pendidikan Ibu Dengan GPA	98
Jadual 4.37b : Jadual Ujian Bonferroni Tahap Pendidikan Ibu Dengan GPA	99
Jadual 4.38 : Perhubungan Di Antara Jumlah Jam Belajar Seminggu Dengan Pencapaian Akademik Pelajar	100
Jadual 4.39 : Perhubungan Rangsangan Pembelajaran Dengan GPA	101
Jadual 4.40 : Perhubungan Stail Pembelajaran Dengan GPA	103
Jadual 4.41 : Penerimaan Dan Penolakan Hipotesis	105

SENARAI RAJAH

Muka surat

Rajah 2.1 : Peringkat-Peringkat Kitaran Belajar Kolb	20
Rajah 2.2 : Stail Pembelajaran Yang Berhubungan Dengan Kitaran Pembelajaran	21
Rajah 3.1 : Kerangka Konseptual Pencapaian Akademik	39
Rajah 4.1 : Skor Min Stail Pembelajaran Dengan Jantina	78
Rajah 4.2 : Skor Min Stail Pembelajaran Dengan Pelbagai Program	81

BAB I

PENGENALAN

Pengenalan

Pembelajaran adalah satu proses reflektif di mana pelajar membangun tanggapan dan pemahaman baru atau menukarkan dan membentuk proses mentalnya. Dengan pembentukan ini, pembelajaran menggabungkan kedua-dua pemikiran induktif (spesifik kepada umum) dan pemikiran deduktif (umum kepada spesifik). Pembelajaran boleh dikatakan sebagai satu proses umum manakala pemikiran kritikal dan kreativiti lebih tertumpu kepada aspek-aspek spesifik dalam pembelajaran.

Satu takrifan yang komprehensif mengenai stail pembelajaran telah dibuat oleh satu gerak kerja yang terdiri daripada teoris terkemuka dalam lapangan ini dan ditaja oleh Persatuan Kebangsaan Pengetua-Pengetua Sekolah Menengah. Kumpulan ini menakrifkan stail pembelajaran sebagai gabungan ciri kognitif, afektif dan faktor-faktor fisiologi yang memberi penunjuk yang stabil secara relatif tentang bagaimana seorang pelajar melihat, berinteraksi dengan dan bergerak balas terhadap persekitaran pembelajaran. (Keefe, 1979, ms. 4).

The contents of
the thesis is for
internal user
only

BIBLIOGRAFI

- Ahmad Saat, Syed Jamal Abdul Nasir Syed Mohamad & Jamaludin Ahmad (2001). Students' Learning Styles : A Case Study of UiTM Pahang. Seminar Proceedings. Learning and Motivation : Insights from Multiple Perspectives. Institute for Child and Adolescent Educational Advancement (IKRAK), School of Cognitive Sciences and Education, Universiti Utara Malaysia. Longman. Pearson Education Malaysia Sdn. Bhd.
- Albert, R.S. & Runco (1986). The achievement of eminence. A model based on a longitudinal study of exceptionally gifted boys and their families. Unpublished study. Cited in Md. Farid Ab. Samad, Engku Muhammad Nazri and Bidin Yatim (1992). Predictors of Academic Achievement in Information Technology. Proceedings of the Management Science Operations Research Seminar, Kuala Lumpur. 27-28 July 1992.
- Atkinson, S. (1998). Cognitive style in the context of design and technology work. *Educational Psychology*, 18(2), 183-194.
- Ausubel, D.P., Novak, J.D. & Hanesian, H. (1978). *Educational Psychology : A Cognitive Perspective*, 2nd ed. New York : Holt, Rinehart.
- Azian Ibrahim, Hariharan, N.K. & Syaharom Abdullah (May 1997). Multimedia in the classroom – Fantasy or reality ? Paper presented at the MELTA Biennial International Conference, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- Barbe, W. & Swassing R. (1979). Swassing-Barbe Modality Index, Columbus, HO : Zaner-Bloser. Cited in Irvine, J.J. & York, D.E. (1995). Learning Styles and Culturally Diverse Students : A Literature Review. In *Handbook of research on multicultural education*, ed. James A. Banks, 484-497. New York : Simon and Schuster Macmillan.
- Benbow, C.P. (1983). Adolescence of the mathematically precocious : A five year longitudinal study. Cited in Md. Farid Ab. Samad, Engku Muhammad Nazri and Bidin Yatim (1992). Predictors of Academic Achievement in Information Technology. Proceedings of the Management Science Operations Research Seminar, Kuala Lumpur. 27-28 July 1992.

- Benbow, C.P. & Arjmand, O. (1989). Predictors of High Academic Achievement in Mathematics and Science by Mathematically Talented Students : A Longitudinal Study. Cited in Md. Farid Ab. Samad, Engku Muhammad Nazri and Bidin Yatim (1992). Predictors of Academic Achievement in Information Technology. Proceedings of the Management Science Operations Research Seminar, Kuala Lumpur. 27-28 July 1992.
- Biberman, G. & Buchanan, J. (1986). Learning style and study skills differences across business and other academic majors. *Journal of Education for Business*, 61, pp. 303-307.
- Biggs, J.B. (1987). *Student Approaches to Learning and Studying* (Research Monograph). Melbourne : Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Biggs, J.B. & Moore, P.J. (1993). *The process of learning* (3rd edition ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice Hall.
- Bonwell, C.C. & Eison, J.A. (1991). *Active Learning : Creating Excitement in the Classroom*. Washington, DC : George Washington University.
- Brainard, S.R. & Oremen, J.L. (1977). Men, women and learning styles. *Community College Frontiers*, 5(3), pp. 32-36.
- Brown, J.D. (1988). *Understanding research in second language learning*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Canfield, A. (1988). Learning Styles Inventory Manual. Los Angeles, CA : Western Psychological Services.
- Canfield, A.A. & Knight, W.(1983). Learning Styles Inventory. Los Angeles, CA : Western Psychological Services.
- Carbo, M., Dunn, R. & Dunn, K. (1991). *Teaching Students To Read Through Their Individual Learning Styles*. Prentice Hall.
- Carpenter, V.L., Friar, S. & Lipe, M.G. (1993). Evidence on the performance of accounting students : race, gender and expectations, *Issues in Accounting Education*, 8(1), 1-17.

- Cheang E. K., Amreet K. & Nik Suria Nik Mohamad (1994). A Survey Of The Learning Styles Among The ITM Perlis Students In The Study Of The English Language. Presented to Research and Consultancy Centre, Institut Teknologi MARA, 40450 Shah Alam, Selangor.
- Davis, J.K. & Cochran, K.F. (1989). An information processing view of field-dependence-independence. *Early Child Development and Care*, 43,129-145.
- De Bello, T.C. (1990). Comparison of eleven major learning styles models : variables, appropriate populations, validity of instrumentation, and the research behind them. *Reading, writing and Learning Disabilities*, 6 : 203-222.
- Delucchi, J.J., Rohwer, W.D. Jr., & Thomas, J.W. (1987). Study Time Allocation as a Function of Grade Level and Course Characteristics. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 12, pp. 365-380.
- Doran, M.B., Marvin, L. & Smith, C.G. (1991). Determinants of student performance in accounting principles I and II, *Issues in Accounting Education*, 6 (1), 74-84.
- Dunn, R., Cavanaugh, D., Eberle, B., & Zenhausern, R. (1982). Hemispheric preference : The newest element of learning style, *The American Biology Teacher*, 44,5 (May), 291-294.
- Dunn, R., Gemake, J., Jalali, F., Zenhausern, R., Quinn, P. & Spiridakis, J. (1990, April). Cross-cultural differences in the learning styles of elementary-age students from four ethnic backgrounds. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 18(2), 68-93.
- Dunn, R., Dunn, K & Price, G. (1978). Learning Style Inventory. Lawrence, KS : Price Systems.
- Dunn, R., Dunn K & Price, G. (1982). Manual : Productivity environmental preference survey. Lawrence, KS : Price Systems.
- Dunn, R. & Griggs, S. (1996). Hispanic American Students and Learning Style. ERIC Digest, ED 393607.

- Entwistle, N.J. & Ramsden, P. (1983). *Understanding Student Learning*. London : Croom Helm.
- Flavell, J. (1985). *Cognitive Development*, 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice Hall.
- Garner, C.W. & Cole, E.G. (1986). The achievement of students in low-ses settings : An investigation of the relationship between locus and control and field dependence. *Urban Education*, 21 (2), 189-206.
- Gooding, Y. (2001). The relationship between parental educational level and academic success of college freshmen. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A : Humanities and Social Sciences*. Vol. 62 (2-A), pp. 484. US : Univ Microfilms International.
- Griffee, D.T. (1996). Reliability and a learner style questionnaire. In G.van Troyer, S. Cromwell and H. Morikawa (Eds.), *Proceedings of the JALT 1995 International Conference on Language Teaching / Learning*. pp.283-292. Tokyo : The Japan Association for Language Teaching.
- Griffee, D.T. (1997). Validating a questionnaire on confidence in speaking English as a foreign language. *The JALT Journal*, 19 (2), 177-197.
- Habibah Alias, Zaidatul Akmaliah Lope Pihie & Rahil Hj Mahyuddin. (1995). Persepsi Pelajar Terhadap Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran. *Jurnal Pendidik dan Pendidikan*, Jilid 14, Universiti Pertanian Malaysia.
- Hanks, G.F. & Shivaswamy, M. (1985). Academic performance in accounting : Is there a gender gap ? *Journal of Business Education*, 154-6.
- Heather, T., Robin, C. & Takahiro, K. (2000). Relating Preferred Learning Style to Student Achievement. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. (Vancouver, BC, March 14-18, 2000). ERIC No : ED 445513.
- Hobbs, D. (1990). School based community development : Making connections for improved learning. In Raferty S. & Mulkey D. (Eds). *The Role of Rural Schools in Community Development*, pp. 57-64. Mississippi State, MS. Southern Rural Development Center.

- Honey, P. & Mumford, A. (1992). *Manual of Learning Styles*. Peter Honey, London, UK.
- James, W.B. & Gardner, D.L. (1995). Learning styles : Implications for distance learning. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education* no. 67, 19-32. Cited from Brown, B.L. (1998). *Learning Styles and Vocational Education Practice*. EAN Library : Articles on Education. [Online] <http://library.educationamerica.net/a1/a1-07.html> (28/01/2001).
- Johnson, D.W. & Johnson, R.T. (1989). *Cooperation and competition : Theory and research*. Edina, MN : Interaction Book. Cited in Tengku Nor Rizan Tengku Mohd Maasum (2000). *All For One, One For All*. Prosiding Seminar Pendidikan Kebangsaan 2000. Kepelbagaian Pelajar : Cabaran dan Strategi. Fakulti Pendidikan Universiti Kebangsaan, Bangi.
- Kagan, S. (1989). *Cooperative learning resources for teachers*. San Juan Capistrano, CA : Resources for Teachers. Cited in Tengku Nor Rizan Tengku Mohd Maasum (2000). *All For One, One For All*. Prosiding Seminar Pendidikan Kebangsaan 2000. Kepelbagaian Pelajar : Cabaran dan Strategi. Fakulti Pendidikan Universiti Kebangsaan, Bangi.
- Keefe, J.W. (1979). Learning Style : An Overview. In NASSP's Student Learning Styles : Diagnosing and prescribing program (pp 1-17). Reston, VA : National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Keith, T.Z. (1982). Time spent on homework and high school grades : A large-sample path analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74, pp. 248-253.
- Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia (1973). *Kajian Keciciran*. Kuala Lumpur : Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Kolb, D.A. (1976). *Learning Style Inventory. Technical Manual*. (Massachusetts, Institute for Development Research).
- Kolb, D.A. (1984). *Experiential Learning : experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice-Hall.
- Lai Mooi Tho (1994). Some evidence on the determinants of student performance in the University of Malaya introductory accounting course. *Issues in Accounting Education* 3 (4), pp. 331-340.

- Lam-Phoon, S. (1986). A comparative study of the learning styles of southeast Asian and American Caucasian college students of two Seventh-Day Adventist Campuses. Doctoral dissertation, Andrews University, Michigan.
- Larson, W.L. & Slocum, W.L. (1969). The Impact of Poverty on Rural Youth : An Analysis of the Relationship Between Family Income and Educational Aspirations, Self-Concept Performance, and Values of Rural High School Students. ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.
- Lipe, M.G. (1989). Further evidence on the performance of female versus male accounting students, *Issues in Accounting Education*, 4 (1), 144-52.
- Mannino, F.V. (1962). Family Factors Related to School Persistence. *Journal of Educational Sociology*, Vol. 35, No. 5, pp. 193-202. Cited from Razali bin Arof (1985). Rural Students and Academic Performance : A Case Study of "Program Matrikulasi" Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia. PhD Thesis. UMI Dissertation Information Service, Michigan.
- Martinez, R. & Norman, R.D. (1984). Effects of acculturation on field independence among Chicano children. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 6, 113-126.
- Mason, E.J. & Bramble W.J. (1989). Understanding and Conducting Research. New York : McGraw-Hill, pp. 260-263.
- Matthews, D.B. (1991). The effects of learning styles on grades of first-year college students. *Research in Higher Education*, 32(3), 253-268.
- Matthews, D.B. (1994). An investigation of students' learning styles in various disciplines in colleges and universities. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling Education and Development*. Vol. 33 Issue 2, p. 65.
- Maznah Ismail & Yoong Suan (1995). Kajian Terhadap Pendekatan Pembelajaran Pelajar. *Jurnal Pendidik dan Pendidikan*, Jilid 14, pp. 11-18.
- McCaulley, M.H. & Natter, F.L. (1980). (Myers-Briggs) Psychological type differences in education. Gainesville, Fla. : Center for Application of Psychological Type.

- Merriam, S.B. & Caffarella, R.S. (1991). *Learning in Adulthood*. San Francisco, CA : Jossey-Bass. Cited from Brown, B.L. (1998). Learning Styles and Vocational Education Practice. EAN Library : Articles on Education. [Online] <http://library.educationamerica.net/a1/a1-07.html> (28/01/2001).
- Miller, C.D., Always M. & McKinley, D.L. (1987). Effects of learning styles and Strategies on academic success. *Journal of College Student Personnel* 28(5) : 400-404.
- Miller, G. (1997). Are distance education programs more acceptable to field-independent learners ? (ERIC Document Reproduction Service Number 409854).
- Miller, G. & Honeyman, M. (1997). The interaction effect of teaching approach and learning style on student achievement and satisfaction in a senior level animal science course. Proceeding of AAAE Central Region Research Conference in Agricultural Education, St. Louis, Missouri.
- Most, R. & Zeidner, M. (1995). Constructing personality and intelligence instruments. In Saklofske D.H. and Zeidner M. (Eds.), *International handbook of personality and intelligence*. pp. 417-446. New York : Plenum Press.
- Mutchler, J.F., Turner, J.H. & Williams, D.D. (1987). The performance of female versus male accounting students, *Issues in Accounting Education*, 2 (1), 103-11.
- Myers, I.B. (1990). *Gifts differing*. 2nd ed. Palo Alto, Calif. : Consulting Psychologist Press.
- Napolitano, R.A. (1986). An experimental investigation of the relationships among achievement, attitude scores, and traditionally, marginally, and underprepared college students enrolled in an introductory psychology course when they are matched and mismatched with their learning style preferences for the element of structure. Doctoral dissertation, St. John's University. Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 435A.
- Nelson, B., Dunn, R., Griggs, S., Primavera, L., Fitzpatrick, M., Bacilious, Z. & Miller, R. (1993). Effects of learning style intervention on college students' retention and achievement. *Journal of College Student Development*, 34, 364—369.

- Okpala, C.O., Okpala, A.O. & Smith, F.E. (2001). Parental Involvement, Instructional Expenditures, Family Socioeconomic Attributes, and Student Achievement. *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 95 issue 2, p. 110.
- Oltman, P.K., Raskin, E. & Witkin, H.A. (1971). *Group Embedded Figures Test*. Consulting Psychologists Press : Palo Alto, CA.
- Orr, K.L. & Davidson, G.V. (1992). The effects of group computer-based instruction and learning style on achievement and attitude. *Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia*, 1,781-792.
- Oxford, R.L. (1997). Cooperative learning, collaborative learning and interaction : Three communicative strands in the language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, iv. Cited in Tengku Nor Rizan Tengku Mohd Maasum (2000). All For One, One For All. Prosiding Seminar Pendidikan Kebangsaan 2000. Kepelbagaian Pelajar : Cabaran dan Strategi. Fakulti Pendidikan Universiti Kebangsaan, Bangi.
- Pask, G. (1976). Styles and Strategies of Learning. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 46, 128-148.
- Pintrich, R., Smith, D.A.F., Garcia, T. & McKeachie, W.J. (1991). Reliability and predictive validity of the motivated strategies for learning questionnaire (MSLQ). *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53, 801-813.
- Raven, M.R., Cano, J., Garton, B.L. & Shellharner, V. (1993). A comparison of learning styles, teaching styles, and personality style of preservice Montana and Ohio Agricultural Teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 31(1), 40-50.
- Reid, J. (1987). The Learning Style Preference of ESL Students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21 (2), 87-111.
- Riding, R. & Cheema, I. (1991). Cognitive styles – an overview and integration. *Education Psychology*, 11 (3 & 4) pp. 193-215.
- Riding, R. & Grimley, M. (1999). Cognitive style and learning from multimedia materials in 11-year children. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 30(1), 43-59.

- Robotham, D. (1999). The application of learning style theory in higher education teaching. Wolverhampton Business School, University of Wolverhampton.
- Ross, J.L., Drysdale, M.T.B. dan Schulz, R.A. (2001). Cognitive Learning Styles and Academic Performance in Two Postsecondary Computer Application Courses. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, Summer 2001, Vol. 33 Issue 4, p400, 13p, 4 charts.
- Saracho, O.N. (1988). Cognitive styles and young children's learning. *Early Child Development and Care*, 30, 213-220.
- Sawyer, E. (1995). The need for structure among high school students : When is enough, enough? *NASSP Principal*. Reston, VA : National Association for Secondary School Principals, 79 (569), 85-92.
- Schuman, H., Walsh, E., Olson, C., & Etheridge, B. (1985). Effort and reward : The assumption that college grades are affected by quantity of study. *Social Forces*, 63, pp. 945-966.
- Sekaran, U. (1992). *Research Methods For Business : A Skill - Building Approach. Second Edition*. John Wiley & Sons, Canada, p. 253.
- Sharifah Azizah Syed Sahil & Wan Zalina Wan Din (1995). Students' Preferential Learning Styles. Unpublished research report. Unit Koleksi Khas. Perpustakaan Sultanah Bahiyah. Universiti Utara Malaysia.
- Sims, J.E. (1988). Learning styles : A comparative analysis of the learning styles of Black-American, Mexican-American, and White-American third and fourth grade students in traditional public schools. Doctoral dissertation, University of Santa Barbara.
- Sormunen, C. (1993). Learning style : An analysis of factors affecting keyboarding achievement of elementary school students. *Delta-Pi-Epsilon-Journal*. 35 (1), 26-38.
- Swanson, L.J. (July 1995). Learning Styles : A Review of the Literature. (ED 387067).

- Syed Hassan bin Syed Mahdar (2000). The Teaching-Learning Style Of An Accounting Subject : A Study Of Diploma Students In Business Studies, MARA University Of Technology Perlis Campus. Unpublished Project Paper, Master of Science (Human Resource Development), Universiti Putra Malaysia.
- Ting, S.R. & Robinson, T.L. (1998). First-year academic success : a prediction combining cognitive and psychosocial variables for Caucasian and African American students. *Journal of College Student Development*. Vol. 39 (6), pp. 599-610.
- Tyson, T. (1989). Grade performance in introductory accounting courses : why female students outperform males, *Issues in Accounting Education*, 4 (1), 153-60.
- Whitefield, D. (1995). Learning styles – great minds don't think alike! In Summers, L. (Ed), A Focus on Learning, p271-275. Proceedings of the 4th Annual Teaching Learning Forum, Edith Cowan University, February 1995. Perth : Edith Cowan University.
- <http://cleo.murdoch.edu.au/asu/pubs/tlf/tlf95/whit271.html>
- Witkin, H.A., Moore, C.A., Goodenough, D.R. & Cox, P.W. (1977). Field-dependent and field-independent cognitive styles and their educational implications. *Review of Educational Research*, 47(1), 1-64.